

The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. II.—NO. 10.

NEW-YORK SATURDAY, JANUARY 19, 1861.

WHITE NUMBER 92.

The Principia

Published Weekly, at No. 1 Pearl Street, two doors above
Harpers' Buildings, New-York.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.
FARNER WILSON, Proprietor.

TERMS One dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to
ELIJAH THOMAS R. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,
as above.

PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, moral, social, Christian reforms; the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the race-tradition, and aristocratic privilege; the abolition of all forms of slavery, domestic and foreign; the abolition of all forms of war;—to the individual, the family, the State, the Nation;—to the work of converting the world to God; restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the type of heaven. Our last book to the Nation; our standard, the Divine law of expediency, obedience, love, the Gospel; our trust, the Divine press. See our paper, the whole arm of God.

Our Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

THE BIBLE ABOLITIONIST:

Containing the Testimony of the Scriptures against Slavery, and the Scriptural Law of Treating it.

"To the law and to the testimony—if they speak not according to the word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. viii. 20.—"We perceive it given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the way of God might be perfect, that we might be furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. iii. 17. 18. 19.

Part III.—Slaveholding brought directly to the test of the Bible.

CHAPTER III.

TREATMENT OF THE SAVIOUR IN THE PERSON OF HIS BRETHREN.—SINNERS OF ENSLAVING THE BODIES OF MEN.

In our Saviour's solemn account of the final judgment, as recorded in the 25th Chapter of Matthew, we are impressively taught that when, as the Son of man, he shall sit upon the throne of his glory, to judge all men, "separating them one from another, as a shepherd divides his sheep from the goats"—setting the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left!—He will then regard the treatment which each one of them has extended to "one of this least of my brethren" as the treatment of himself, and appoint them their eternal destiny, accordingly.

Lives there the man who, believing these words of the Saviour, would be willing to appear before him in the judgment, in the character of one who had held the Saviour *Himself* as a slave—as "goods and chattels personal, to all intents and purposes whatsoever?"

No. There is not one. This like every one know that if he holds "one of the least"—the most despised of the Saviour's "brethren,"—in that condition, it will be regarded as the same thing.

All men are the brethren of "the Son of Man" as being, according to the true human brotherhood, which appears to be the import of the passage. But even if the meaning be restricted to his spiritual creation, his disciples, the infinite hazards of leading a brother living in slavery, should appear even a reprobate! How do you know that the despised one whom you hold as a slave is not one of the number who will be found, at last, on the right hand of your judge? Will not this prove to be the fact, the Judge has already laid you on the other-hand, for the very purpose of forewarning you that your place must then be, on the left?

SIXTY-NINE.—ENSLAVING THE BODIES OF MEN.

Some six-and-dars dozen slaves there are, and are still red by their former teachers, with the double ergo, that they only hold the bodies, not the souls, of their own brethren, and Christ's brethren, as slaves, as goods and chattels personal. And therefore they expect to escape condemnation!

What know ye not that your body is the temple of the

Holy Ghost? (1 Cor. vi. 19.) Know ye not that your brother's body is also his temple? "If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy?" (1 Cor. iii. 17.) Will you dare to defile that temple by making it a chattel, and herding it with beasts? "Let no man deceive himself; if any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool that he may be wise [ibid in continuation.] What folly can compare with the pretended wisdom that justifies the enslavement of the soul, on pretense that it is not the enslavement of the soul? Who does not know that the soul is crushed and maimed by the process? What would you think of the man that should claim your body as a chattel, and then insult you with the pretense that your soul was left free? At what price would you value the mere body of your slave, after the soul had departed from it? "Be not deceived: God is not mocked!"

—Christ is "the Savior of the body" as well as of the soul (Eph. v. 23). "Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ?" (1 Cor. vi. 15)—that ye must "present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God" (Rom. xii.)—that "the spirit, and soul, and body" must "be presented blameless, unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ?" (1 Thess. v. 23) that "a perfect man" "able also to bridle the whole body!" (James iii. 2), and, of course, is entitled to have the control of his body, in despite of the impious claims of those whose merchandise is in "slaves and 'og-men'" (Rev. xiii. 13). What effrontery, or what folly can exceed that of so separating the soul from the body as to claim that injuries done to the one are not injuries to the other, and are therefore no injury at all? If man is to be judged according to the deeds done here in the body, then he who claims unlimited irresponsible power over the body, and all its acts, claims corresponding authority over the soul, likewise. Christ went doing good to the bodies as well as to the souls of men. He came to redeem the bodies as well as the souls of men, and little do those know of his mission or exhibit of his spirit, who tell us that they are too intent on saving the souls of men, to take thought for their bodies! Such was not the spirit of Christ.

The man would be thought to be either insane, or a moral monster who should gravely undertake to justify himself in the practice of maiming men's limbs and poisoning their bodies, on the plea that the soul is so infinitely superior to the body, that, in the comparison, the condition of the body and limbs is a trifling affair—protecting that he leaves men's souls free from injury, and even labors and prays for their salvation, all the time, he is cutting and hacking their bodies! But this is, in substance, the argument frequently and sanctimoniously urged to attenuate or justify the crime of slaveholding, by professors and ministers of religion. Yet who would not rather prefer to be maimed in his limbs and poisoned in his body than to have his body and limbs wrested from him by violence and used instantaneously as a machine for whatever purpose an irreverent person, pretending to be their "owner" might see fit to impose?

Slaveholding must be wrong, for it is contrary to the genius of the gospel and the spirit of the Saviour. What Christian may, what could slaveholder that has ever read the New-Testament, would not be moved at the statement, if he were to say it might be, that Jesus of Nazareth, who on earth was a slave, "died?" Who would not feel the gravity and importunity of the statement? But Jesus was the true representative of the slaves, and if they would but look at them, they cannot be slaveholders.

The apostle perhaps added this reason for the benefit of those who imagined that they could preserve their costly plant, yet suffer their bodies to be defiled by sensuality.

NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

No. 26

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

The President, in his late annual Message, recognises a "sacred right of property" in slaves,—how sacred we shall see. The Constitution in a general and natural way recognizes a right of property, but does not specify particularly in what things property shall consist. It does not expressly recognize a right of property in a horse, a ship, a plow, a garden, or a house. What shall be property is left to the natural sense of justice to decide. But for the right of property in slaves, Mr. Buchanan seeks, by amendment of the Constitution, the peculiar favor of the Legislature.

Surely, that must be a *very* sacred right of property, or else a *very questionable* one, which demands to be so distinguished. And, further, who has the amanuensis to recognize "the duty of protecting this right in all the *numerous* territories throughout their territorial extent, and until they shall be admitted as States into the Union?" And why not plead for the same favor for the right of property in cattle and sheep? Is it because that right is not sufficiently sacred?

Further, the President proposes to have "a like recognition of the right of the master to have his slave, who has escaped from one State to another, restored and delivered up" to him, and of the validity of the Fugitive Slave Law. But he proposes no such recognition in favor of other property and the Constitution contains none. A thief may take a large value in money or goods, and escape into another State, but there is no warrant in the Constitution for a fugitive thief law, like our Fugitive Slave Law. Only slave property is deemed sacred enough to be entitled to such constitutional guardianship. Mr. Buchanan thinks the slave states demand nothing but to be let alone, but surely he demands something more for them, if he would make *the* duty of Northern people to run after fugitive slaves.

As the Constitution now is, it is inconsistent, but adopts Mr. Buchanan's amendments, and it will contradict itself. It recognises the slaves as persons and requires their consideration with the rest of the people of the United States. Now, persons and properties are essentially different things. Property has no rights and is not amenable to laws. Just the opposite is true of persons. Slaves, as persons, are subject to the laws of the United States. The Constitution recognises the right of property as belonging to persons. The claim of slave renderings rests on the principle that slaveholders are our countrymen, fellow citizens of the same government. This principle is correct. The principle of the Union is truly a principle of sympathy and mutual aid. The Constitution is a national covenant, by which each individual is engaged to respect and favor the rights of all the rest. The humblest man in the Union has a just claim upon all the rest, to be supported in the enjoyment of his rights. The dearer the right, the stronger the claim. The more vigorous the sympathy, and the wider the extension, the more it embodies all climes and countries, and human beings, throughout the Union. Such sympathy, such a bond, and the opposite to Sympathy for the slaveholder will lead us to oppose the master in his efforts to wrench with the master will prompt us to contend earnestly for the right of property and against his being defrauded of fair wages. Now, if the slaveholder is made to recognize the right of property in cattle, while he is at the same time denied the right of property in persons, then will the master be compelled to give up his slaves. What a remedy for slavery! Is it reasonable that we should be required to sympathise with the slaveholder, as our fellow citizens, and sustain him in claims ridiculous both to himself and the Union, and at the same time, be gagged, while he is practising on robbing others?

THE PRINCIPIA.

equally our own and more useful, than in saving men, all the dear rights of humanity? Will you judge ye?

ENLARGEMENT OF THE PRINCIPAL, &c.

LETTER OF REV. B. SMITH.

West Roxbury, Mass., Dec. 25, 1860

Dear Sir. By every reader of the Principia which I read, I am more and more impressed with the great importance of having it extensively circulated, and read. When it will be so is generally confused, and bewildered by the sophistries and falsehoods, that emanate from sources supposed to be of high authority, it seems indispensable that the people should have such clear development of fundamental principles, as they would get in the Principia. But it is impossible to circulate the Principia in its present form, very extensively. What is needed, is a larger paper, with room for greater variety. I would venture to do my best, by compressing as much, into small a space. You need and ought to have a larger engine. Is it not possible to have a weekly paper, as large as the Congregationalist? It would undoubtedly take some time to make it self-supporting, but I believe it would be sustained if it should have a fair trial.

I rejoice to learn that Dr. Cheever is having good success in his mission over the sea. How could a portion of the fund which he will raise, be better used, than by enlarging your paper, and giving it wider circulation? Such a paper, conducted by Mr. Goodell, and Dr. Cheever, would be the most powerful engine for good in theocracy, and would, no doubt, have a wide circulation. I merely make the suggestion. I presume you can bring about such an arrangement if any body can. I believe that an extensive circulation of such a paper, would do more to promote pure and undefiled religion, than all the papers in the country besides. I believe that what you have repeatedly said, in reference to the people sustaining a Presidential candidate of the right stamp, if they should have the opportunity, would be found equally true of such a paper as I speak of. If such a paper could be put into the hands of the honest-hearted people, all over the country, they would read it with interest, and sustain it with an enthusiasm, which has never yet been witnessed. If I am not greatly mistaken, there is a wide spread feeling, among the honest Christian people of the country, that they have been deceived, and cheated long enough, by the professed, and promises, of men, and papers, that were thought to be in favor of the fundamental principles of righteousness, but who by a trickling duplicitly become "blind leaders of the blind." For my own part I am thoroughly disgusted with the great flourish of trumpets, in view of supposed victories, which are only shameful defeats. I am vexed beyond measure, by the imbecility, and I fear dishonesty of otherwise able men, and papers, in reference to the first principles of the doctrines of God. How unmercifully he leaves his right-hand, from his left, can fail to perceive that slavery is inherently sinful. I do not understand. I should greatly rejoice to see one large sized, weekly paper, with the spirit, and power of the Principia. If there is no intelligence, and virtue enough in the country to sustain it, then we are doomed people.

Praying fervently for your life, and usefulness may be prolonged yet many years. I am yours very truly,

B. SMITH.

REV. MR. GOODELL.

ANOTHER LETTER FROM A. L. POST.

DEAR SIR.—I enclose a copy of A. L. Post to me N. Y. Times, with some remarks of his own.

My friend, I addressed a short letter to the Tribune, containing some further remarks and suggestions. Not having seen

the Tribune, I will copy it out to the Principia.

To the Editor of the N. Y. Times.

Dear Sir.—I thank you for the notice you gave my question. I know it to be a cause of sufficient difficulty to be solved.

and so I knew how to begin my way to get them solved, and so I knew to whom they were, and have them discussed.

The present state of things in our country must, of course, suggest many difficulties, which may be easily

solved. But, if you will give me a few moments, I will

solved, reasons why. All the light wise men have may be wise for the same purpose of drawing it out. Pursuing this subject, earnestly and far from motives of mere speculation or inquiry, permits me to say that your answers to my questions can suggest difficulties, which if you will solve, you will have the thanks of at least some of your patients.

Not understanding so clearly as citizenship under a higher or lower law, you say "our judgment would be that State and Federal laws are each paramount in their proper sphere respectively; and that neither is necessarily and in all cases above the other." Your judgment I think well of. It is happily guarded, and yet does not, as it seems to me, exactly meet the question suggested in Art VI clause 2, of the Constitution. That as you are aware reads as follows—

"The Congress and the laws of the United States, which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, by the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, as well as by the laws made in Congress, during the existence of the Government of the United States."

Here we have the Supreme law of the land.

"So now, J. N. Green, a High-ton in authority, giving the highest place in Government or power, Webster."

It was in this sense I referred to a higher law, as applied to the Constitution, and Federal laws enacted in accordance therewith. "The proper sphere" of Federal laws, I make to be, the entire scope of the Constitution.

"We the people of the United States" have prescribed that sphere, and we the people of the several States have ratified it. Within it, Federal laws are the Supreme law of the land. Where there is a *higher or highest*, it is presumed that there may be a *lower or lowest*—whereas a supreme, a subordinate law. Congressional legislation, if Constitutional, appears to be supreme, and if there is subordinate or lower legislation, it must be *State*—for outside of Congress there are no legislative bodies, in the land, but State Governments. The latter, in case of infringement, must yield to the former. So much by way of apology.

Now, to the question. Is the Federal law, which establishes citizenship, i. e., which makes a man a citizen of the United States "entitled (Con. Art IV Sec. II, "Clause 1) to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States," within its Constitutional or proper sphere? If no, can a State law, in its "proper sphere" abolish that citizenship, and make the man an alien? This is substantially my question, and pardon me, if in the present crisis, I have overestimated its importance.

Please indulge me a little farther. You say—"Even though but half the State Governments were blotted out, this would soon deprive the Senate of a quorum, and thus render it impotent." How is this? The Senate consists of two members from each State in the Union. Can one or half, or more, or less, States out of or in the Union, after the fact of a Constitutional number of members, on a Constitutional quorum? The Constitution declares (Art. I Sec. V Cl. 1) that "a majority of each [House] shall constitute a quorum, to do business." Were there but two States in the Union would not three Senators constitute a Constitutional quorum?

But not to take advantage of what cannot meet the eye, I will, however, I would have the truth set forth in relation to the extreme case. If all the State Governments to cease to be homogeneous with us, it will be an important question whether or not, therefore, the entire structure of our national government is such that it must cease to be? Not that there is a probability of such an event, but that the question involved in it once settled, would very much aid in settling those which are now forever upon the nation by the spirit of secession. *Is our Government a Confederacy of States, or a Government of the people?* Are State Rights, whether out of or in the Union, superior to or above the Union? Are they in the Union different from the rights of individuals? Are they out of the Union or in other words reserved, anything different in their nature from the reserved rights of individual persons? Are reserved State rights anything more than rights to forms and administer governments according to the C. nstitution? Then, as to the question of the Constitution to be the supreme law of the land, must in some way be settled.

If we are to adopt the rules of moral expediency, the best of a very bad state of things, *existing* at no Constitutional revolution or revision, it is, as far as we have consequence to discuss or settle these questions as. Which course shall we pursue? Let us have a clear understanding, that we may all if disposed act together. If the Government is not in what it should be, it will not be beaten, nor can it be beaten, unless the public will act to settle it.

And so, I thank you again for the notice you gave my question. I know it to be a cause of sufficient difficulty to be solved.

and so I knew how to begin my way to get them solved, and so I knew to whom they were, and have them discussed.

The present state of things in our country must, of course, suggest many difficulties, which may be easily

solved. But, if you will give me a few moments, I will

solve, and understand, it is good enough—the best in the world, to us understand and administer it. Let us, though the Heavens fall. A. L. Post.

Monroe, Pa. Dec. 1st, 1860.

THE CHICAGO REPUBLICAN PLATFORM.

Published annually, except in years of war, by the Chicago Tribune, and a member of the Popular Sovereignty League.

Our readers will remember that during the recent Presidential canvass, we noted that the Chicago Republican platform was evasive and ambiguous—that it did not premise a federal exclusion of slavery from the territories, but, on the other hand, left the door open for the greater sovereignty doctrine again, which the Republican party was at first organized, and which had constituted the soul of its empire, in the Free Soil campaign of 1856. The majority of our Republican friends were incredulous and thought us over jealous and ambitious. And when we published the fact, in extracts (given by Hon. Mr. Rockwood of Connecticut) from the Journal of Congress, that the Republican Representatives in Congress, under the lead of Hon. Galusha A. Grow a short time before the Chicago union passed, and in a body voted for the organization, of five or six new territories without any restriction against slavery, (though the measure finally failed of being adopted) the statement extensively failed of gaining credence, as both Republican and Democratic journals had political reasons for suppressing the fact, which we never saw published in any paper, save the *Principia*.

The Republicans did not wish to have the anti-slavery wing of their party know that they had relinquished the foundation doctrine of Federal exclusion of slavery from territories, lest they should lose Free Soil and Anti-Slavery votes. The Douglass Democrats wished to monopolize the popular sovereignty doctrine to themselves, and the Breckinridge Democrats wished it to be believed that the Republicans were opposed to "the rights of the South" and so the real facts of the case were kept concealed, by all parties.

But they have leaked out, at last. The discussions among the Republican leaders have now brought them to light, as will be seen from the following which, together with the preceding statements, we hope our readers will study and consider.

"THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM.—Some discussion has arisen in the public Press concerning the meaning and intention of the Republican Chicago platform in regard to the Congressional prohibition of Slavery in the Territories. It is reported that in the Tribune of Jan 1, 1860, it was announced that Mr. Lincoln would adhere strictly to that platform. Upon this the Cincinnati Commercial states that the platform was designedly framed so as not to commit the party to the Congressional prohibition of Slavery, but to leave its action open to the principle of absolute non-intervention. The Commercial adds:

"Mr. Greeley, of the Tribune, knows of his own certain knowledge that the platform was framed with a view to recognize the absolute rights of the master, as of absolute non-intervention. And yet the Tribune makes a junction with the Commercial in the assertion that Mr. Lincoln meant that Congress shall prohibit Slavery in the Territories. Mr. Greeley labored assiduously in the Committee on Resolution to give the absolute non-intervention idea unequivocal expression in the platform of the Legislatives, and in the resolution on Resolution No. 1, the following, designed to cover the Territories:

"That having8 Right to be the natural birthright of every human being, we maintain that Slavery only exists where it has been previously established by law, or continually supported by law, or where it is maintained by force, or where it is upheld by the law of a master, and that it should be prohibited in the Territories by legislative action of the judicial creation."

This though a little awkward in prose logic, is very artfully constructed. It will be observed that it is not affirmed that the people of a Territory may not establish Slavery. Before Mr. Greeley proceeds to talk of squaring principles with the facts, he first means to be ready for him to square the people in a Territory with the facts.

Whatever may have been the necessity of the measure ten years, or even four years ago, it is now generally conceded that the sectional union whatever is required to sustain it. With the great body of the Republicans indeed, the great mass of the people in the Northern States and a very large portion of the South believe that Congress has no constitutional right to legislate for the Territories upon all the subjects, very few indeed, except those which are expedient that this power should now be exercised. The condition of the Territories now belonging to the Union is fixed—and the general inclination of the public is against authorizing it. N. Y. Times.

We have watched to see whether Mr. GREENLEY, the泰
BOSTON, or any Republican or Republican journal, would contradict the foregoing statement of the Commercial, and N. Y. Times. But as far as all

The Principia.

NEW YORK, TUESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1861.

NATIONAL ABOLITION A NATIONAL NECESSITY.

The following article, written by Dr. J. C. H. Miller, of New Haven, Conn., was published in the "Daily Spy" of that city, January 10, 1861. It is reprinted here with the permission of the author.

God has nations—people and their rulers—responsible for national sins. And of all the national sins for which God rebukes us and denounces us, the sin of oppression, and of permitting oppression stands pre-eminent. It was because "the earth was filled with violence" that the old world was destroyed by a flood. In the catalogue of the sins of Sodom, this was one that she did not strengthen hands of the poor and needy. The plagues of Egypt, and the overthrow of Pharaoh and his hosts in the Red Sea, were an account of the sin of oppression. The ten tribes of Israel, and, afterwards, Judah and Jerusalem, went into captivity for the sin of idolatry and oppression. Babylon, Tyre, Rome, and all the ancient nations were punished, and at length destroyed, on account of their national sins, one of the chief of which was the sin of oppression. Universal history is the record of nations tolerating the sin of oppression, and in consequence, coming under the yoke of oppression themselves. God never allows any nation to retain liberty, security, protection, just laws, social order, and exemption from anarchy, lawlessness, rebellion, dissolution, and ultimate subjugation or extinction, on any other condition than that its rulers shall be just, ruling in the fear of God, executing justice between a man and his neighbor, delivering him that is spoiled out of the hands of the oppressor, proclaiming liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof—in one word, protecting the equal and just rights of all their inhabitants.

All the maxims of the Bible are in accordance with this. "For, with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again." "He that stoppeth his ear at the cry of the poor, he also shall cry himself and shall not be heard." They that lead into captivity shall be led captive.

To come under the yoke of oppression themselves, is the natural and appropriate retribution of those who consent to the oppression of their fellow-subjects and fellow men.

The natural tendencies of things, by the laws of human nature, and under the controlling Providence of God, are confessably and irresistibly acting in this direction. The effect of oppression on oppressors is to make them arrogant, over-bearing, beyond the restraints of law, unmindful of covenant obligations, grasping constantly after more power, and seeking new subjects of oppression. Those who, in the same nation, look on and tacitly consent to their oppression, by neglecting to plead for the oppressed, and to demand for them the same protection of law that they claim for themselves, are working most effectively, in many ways than one, to effect their own subjugation in the end. First by exalting the oppressors above themselves, and above law. Secondly, by relinquishing, as Jefferson said, the only adequate security of their liberties, "the conviction that those liberties are the gift of God, that they cannot be violated but with his wrath." Third, by thus becoming themselves as William Pinckney of Maryland said—base and servile enough to let others lord it over them, as well as over others.

All this is applicable to our own country at this time, and is illustrated by our national history, thus far giving indications of its continued illustration, till the catastrophe take place. Of all the oppressive nations of the earth, no nation has rendered its oppressions, our own. Its character is the perfection and climax of oppression, because, as W. C. Weston said—"there being nothing of the kind equal to it in the face of the earth." According to Jefferson, our's is the sin if it is more grievous than age of the world, with which we revolve, and which none dare to oppose.

Oppression, our sin, as such, was but guilty, whenever we say, by a *Government* that tolerates and therefore protects it, or says it is *permitted* and *written* in our free constitutions, and in our fundamental compact.

This gross indifference and support of oppression has been given by this nation, not in the darkness of pagan ignorance, but under the light of the Gospel, not in an age of barbarism, but in an age of advancing civilization, not by a people unacquainted with the first principles of civil liberty, equal rights, and protecting government, but by a people distinctly enumerating them, and declaring them to be self-evident.

More than all this. In the very act of declaring its distinct nationality, and of claiming an independent and equal rank among the nations of the earth, the nation solemnly appealed to the Supreme Judge of the world, for the rectitude of their intentions to establish a Government on the self-evident truth thus proclaimed, a Government for the security of the equal and inalienable rights of all men deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed.

A more solemn national covenant with the Supreme Judge of the world, was never formed on this globe. And, by its express terms, it bound the nation to protect the equal rights of all its inhabitants. This solemn national pledge was renewed, in the Preamble, so called, the first paragraph of the Federal Constitution, setting forth its object to be, "to establish justice and secure the blessings of liberty" to "the people of the United States" and their "posterity." Unless that profession was false and hypocritical, the instrument provided for the freedom of all "the people of the United States and their posterity." If it was not false, then the Constitution itself has been perverted and violated by the continued tolerance of oppression. In either case, the nation stands convicted, before God, before the civilized world, before posterity, and on the sure record of the future historian, of the national sin of oppression, and the national sins of hypocrisy and perjury, in a breach of its solemn covenants and professions, as a nation.

For nearly thirty years past, the average life time of a whole generation, the nation has been faithfully and constantly warned. The messages of Divine truth from God's word, have been repeated to a stiff-necked and gainsaying nation, who have hated, vilified, and persecuted the messengers of truth. The providences of God, in thunder-tones, have uttered his positive attestation to their testimony, and in fulfillment of their direful predictions.

During all this long period, the false prophets have cried peace, peace, and have daubed with untempered mortar, healing the hurt of the nation slightly, instead of probing the sore to the bottom—seeing vanity and divining lies, promising pacification by compromise with the sin. The lead of the false prophets has been followed by the politicians.

The political partisans of the oppressors have been constantly demanding that the agitation of the subject shall cease, yet continuously introducing the agitation of it themselves, by proposing and advocating in the national councils, new outrages and aggressions. Their political opponents have not failed to remind them of this; and to profess that they were, themselves, laboring to remove the *cause* from the arena of national discussion, yet at the same time, they have been found pursuing the discussion, in their own way, not by proposing to get rid of the *oppression itself*, but only of those forms of it which, by interfering with the interests of the free whites were introducing elements of dissension. So that both parties have been trying to hush up the agitation and *restore repose to the nation, without putting away the national sin*.

The Providence of God, and the laws of social humanity ordained and established by him for the ends of his moral government, have hitherto signally defeated all their endeavors. At the compromises and measures of pacification that have been adopted have only been the means of renewing still more intense agitations in new directions. It needs an extraordinary depth of penetration to see that the present unprecedented agitation is the unavoidable and necessary result of the compromises and "pacifications" that have preceded it.

And yet, strange to tell, the National Legislature is, at this very moment occupied with the discussion of further "compromises" and "pacifications"—not one of which could be adopted or recommended by Congress without increasing the present agitation, ten-fold. Nearly all those proposed in a recent motion to amend the Constitution, are very—in other words, a unanimous mandate to relish and to "free" the slaves, altogether.

With all their securities for personal freedom, and resigning themselves to the unlimited rule of our slaveholding masters? To all minds not judicially blinded, it has now become evident that only two alternatives are before us: liberty for all the country, or for a part of it—unless indeed our nationally-reasoned conflict would be reequilibrated. Even then, the irrepresentable conflict would continue, until either one or the other were subdued, until freedom were established at the South, or despotism established at the North.

A national abolition of Slavery is therefore as necessary as the preservation of our nationality, and of the liberties which that nationality was intended to secure.

Which, then, of the two will we choose? A national abolition of slavery or national extinction?

A national abolition of slavery, or the abolition of freedom?

One or the other we must have. There is no middle ground between the two. And all the people have to do is to make up their minds, and let their decision be heard by their Representatives and Senators at the Capitol, in tones that shall be felt and understood. If they want national extinction and slavery, let them be silent while *Treason* on the one hand, and *enslavement, servility or warlike* on the other draw up and sign the death-warrant of nationality and freedom, in the shape of another compromise. If otherwise, let them speak, as they never spoke before, and as becomes a people determined to be free. But let the same and impious fantasy of white freedom and black slavery, very, be at once and forever abjured, as an insult to the Almighty, and a repudiation of common sense.

REVIEW OF REV. HENRY J. VAN DYKE'S Discourse on "the character and influence of Abolitionism." A sermon by Rev. J. R. W. SLOANE, Pastor of the 3d Reformed Presbyterian Church,—preached also in the Church of the Puritans.

We have read this Sermon with great interest and pleasure. It handles such men as Mr. Van Dyke and Dr. Palmer as they ought to be handled. We could wish that a good many Presbyterian Pastors would get to be "Reformed" after the pattern of Mr. Sloane. Mr. Van Dyke's pro-slavery discourse has been widely circulated by the pro-slavery Democrats. The "Review" of it in Mr. Sloane's Sermon, ought to have, at least, a corresponding circulation. Its tone of anti-slavery is undiluted and wholesome. We only regret one short sentence on page 16. "Polygamy was tolerated, slavery was not." We know polygamy, like other vices existed under the Old Dispensation, but we do not think it was tolerated. The late Rev. Amos A. Phelps, in his controversy with the champions of the American Board, settled, we believe, that question.

In his statement of the proper "remedy for existing evils," Mr. Sloane admits of no compromises. We approve all he says under that head. But we should have added one thing more—a *national abolition of slavery*. Mr. Sloane may not agree with our views of the Constitution, but we think he will agree with us that, by a higher law than any human compact or Constitution, the nation is bound to abolish slavery. We repeat our high estimate and warm admiration of his sermon. It forms a pamphlet of 40 pages, and is published by William Erving, No. 5 Beekman Street, New York.

CHURCH ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

There will be a convention of the Christian friends of the Central Anti-Slavery Society for the conduct and prayer over the grave aspects of our country's relation to the human swarms of slaves, on the morning of Saturday and evening of Wednesday, Jan. 22d, & 23d, in the African Union Hall, in the Lecture room of the Central Anti-Slavery Society, 136 Nassau Street, New York City. The Central Anti-Slavery Society is a branch of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.

The Convention will be opened by a service by the Secretary of the Church Anti-Slavery Society, at 10 A.M. Messrs. N. A. Dyer, J. R. W. Sloane, H. M. Parker, H. C. May, H. M. Mulligan, M. F. H. C. L. Longfellow, and others, and prominent friends will be present for the services.

Evangelical friends and members of all the societies, known to us as friends of the slaves, and in their belief, are invited to participate in the debates and discussions of the Convention.

DISCUSSION ON CIVIL GOVERNMENT at the 1st Congregational church, corner of 5th and 11th Streets, Williamsburgh. Question to be discussed, "Is the Civil War a just war?" Tuesday Evening 22d Inst. at 7 o'clock. —W. H. Brewster, moderator. —J. G. Chapman, Vice-moderator. —J. C. H. Miller, Pres.

hand, and with Him all things are possible—*Montly Packet for Ossabaw*

We have received an extract from a letter fully corroborating the remarkable anecdote of The Lady and the Robber, in our October number, and adding some facts that enhanced the wonder and mercy of her escape. We quote the words of the letter:

"In the first place, the robber told her if she had given the slightest alarm or token of resistance, he was fully determined to murder her so that it was really God's good guidance that told her to follow the course she did. Then, before he went away, he said, I never heard such words before. I must have the book you read out of, and carried off her Bible, willingly enough given, you may be sure. This happened many years ago, and only comparatively recently did the lady hear any more of him. She was attending a religious meeting in Yorkshire, where after several noted clergymen and others had spoken, a man arose, stating that he was employed as one of the book-hawkers of the Society, and told the story of the midnight adventure, as a testimony to the wonderful power of the Word of God. He concluded with—I was that man. The lady arose from her seat in the hall, and said quietly, 'It is all quite true, I was the lady, and not down again.'—*Montly Packet for December*

INSTINCT OF PLANTS.

Hoare, in his treatise on the vine, gives a striking exemplification of the instinct of plants. A bone was placed in the strong dry clay of a vine border. The vine sent out a leading, or top root, directly through the clay to the bone. In its passage through the clay the main root threw out fibers, but when it reached the bone it entirely covered it by degrees with the most delicate and minute fibers, like lace, each one sucking at a pore in the bone, like a litter of pigs at their dam, as she lies down on the sunny side of the farm yard. On this curious morsel of a narrow bone would the vine continue to feed as long as any nutriment remained to be extracted. What wonderful analogies there are running through the various forms of animal and vegetable creation, to stimulate curiosity, to gratify research, and, finally, to lead our contemplations from nature, in a feeling of reverence, "up to nature's God."

As to the vine spoken of by Hoare, it is worthy of remark that the root won no farther than the bone, which it seemed to have literally snatched out, as would a hungry dog, in passing.

BAXTER.

Jenkyn, the biographer of Baxter, says:—In preaching Baxter's heart burned within him, and while he was speaking, a live coal from the altar fired his sermons with scriptural fervor. Into his pulpit he brought all the energies of his entire nature. He had a large mind, an acute intellect, a glowing heart, a holy soul, a kindling eye, and a "moving voice," and he called on all that was within him to aid him in his preaching. Being deeply earnest himself, he wished his hearers to be deeply earnest. Himself being a burning light, he wished to flash the hallowed fire into the hearts of others. He seems never to have studied action, or "the start theoretic." The only teacher that gave him lessons in action and attitude was feeling—real, genuine, holy love, and this taught him how to look, how to move, and how to speak. In preaching, as well as in everything religious, he believed with Paul, that "it is a good thing to be always zealously affected, and consequently, that earnest fervid preaching is truly apostolic."

(But Baxter, was an abolitionist, and was as much hated by the *slave* *consecurists* of his times, as Dr. Cheever is now, by the same class.—*Principia*.

OXYGEN AS ANTIODE FOR ETHER AND CHLOROFORM.

Though not coming strictly under the denomination of organic chemistry, we may as well notice here the experiment of M. Osanam, on the use of oxygen as an antidote to ether and chloroform. In all the experiments, M. Osanam found that the animals awoke in half the time after inhaling oxygen than they did with simple atmospheric air. The result was just the same whether ether or chloroform had been used. Savored animals were placed under the influence of ether, until the action of the heart was impeded, and

life and death imminent; but on inhaling oxygen they quickly awoke. In this experiment the animal required at the same time the vapor of ether and pure oxygen. It was twelve minutes before the animal slept, and then the sleep was so light that it awoke in a minute and a half, without the continuation of the oxygen. When chloroform and oxygen were breathed together the animal became drowsy after eight minutes, but did not sleep, and after the inhalations were stopped, perfectly recovered in a few seconds. M. Osanam believes that so long as respiration has not entirely ceased, the revivifying effects of oxygen will be produced, and recommends that the surgeon should always have at his command a supply of oxygen, to reanimate his patients, in case of accidents.—*Chemical News*.

PUNISHING CHILDREN.

Good woman, you have done very wrong in punishing your child in the way you have done; not that he did not deserve all the punishment you gave him, and perhaps even more, but from the manner in which you dealt with him, you left on his mind the impression, that you punished him not for his good, (i. e. to make him better,) but for your own gratification, (i. e. to gratify your revenge,) you made him angry with you, not sorry for his faults; you have irritated him without reforming him, consequently have done him more hurt than good. In the future management of your child, follow these directions:

1st. Take the earliest and every opportunity to instruct him in regard to what is right and what is wrong—what he may do, and what he may not do, and this all embraced under the head of obedience, or disobedience.

2nd. Never punish your child for doing what he did not know to be wrong. Instruct him first.

3rd. Never punish him in such a way as to leave on his mind the impression that you acted from revenge, let him see that you do it from a sense of duty, and only for his good.

4th. When you punish him, bring him to entire submission, and when this is done, show him that it was not choice, but necessity, *duty*, that influenced you, and treat him with kindness and confidence, that you may see and feel that you love him still.

ABIDING IN CHRIST.

President Dwight used to say to his slaves, as they went out from under his care: "Young men, it is not great talent, it is not great learning, that is to enable you to do good but *obedience in Christ*." He then added: "The young man of whom we expected least, all the way through college, has now attained to the greatest excellence and usefulness, and has done the most for the upholding of the cause of the Master." That man was Dr. Nettleton. His hopes were not bright; he was gloomy and despondent all the way through his college course; but he afterwards shook off this dark mantle, and richly exemplified the power and beauty of the religion of Jesus. He was genuinely a holy man—because he abode in Christ, and whenever he went, Christ went with him, and glorified himself through an arm of flesh.—*From the Praise Home*.

ETERNITY has grey hairs. The flowers fade, the heart withers, man grows old and dies, the world lies down in the sepulture of ages, but time writes no wrinkles on eternity. Stupendous thought! The ever-present, unborn, undecaying—and undying—the endless chain, compassing the life of God—the golden thread, entwining the destinies of the universe. Earth has its beauties, but time shrouds them for the grave; its honors are but the sunshine of an hour; its palaces—they are but gilded sepulchres; its pleasures—they are but bursting bubbles. Not so in the untimely bourse. In the dwelling of the Almighty can come no footsteps of decay. Its way will know no darkening—eternal splendor forbids the approach of night.

BEING SINGULAR.

Those that resolve to serve God must not mind being singular in it, nor be drawn by the crowd to forsake his service. Those that are bound for heaven must be willing to swim against the stream and must not do as the most do, but as the best do.

A Christian should aim to make every place the better for him, sowing the seed of the kingdom beside all waters.

TREASURES IN HEAVEN.

We read of a philosopher, who, passing through a mart filled with articles of taste and luxury, made himself quite happy with this simple, yet sage reflection. How many things there are here that I do not want! Now this is just the reflected with which the earnest believer passes happily through the world. It is richly furnished with what are called *good* *things*. It has posts of honor and power, to tempt the restless spirits of ambition of every grade. It has gold and gems, houses and lands, for the covetous and ostentatious. It has immaterial bowers of taste and luxury, where self-indulgence may reign. But the Christian whose piety is deep-toned, and whose spiritual perceptions are clear, looks over the world and exclaims: "How much there is there that I do not want! I have what far better. My treasure is in heaven."—Dr. Tyne.

EFFECT OF MUSIC ON THE SICK.

The effect of music upon the sick has been scarcely at all noticed. In fact, its expensiveness, as it is now, makes general application of it out of the question. I will only mark here, that wind instruments, including the human voice, and stringed instruments, capable of continuous sound, are generally a beneficial effect; while the piano forte, and such instruments as have no continuity of sound, has just the reverse. The pianoforte playing will damage the sick, while an organ, like "Hans, Sweet Home," or "Ainsi a pie d'un saillir," the most ordinary grinding organ, will sensibly soothe the spirit, and quite independent of association.—*Florence Nightingale, Notes on Nursing*.

WARNING TO LADIES TRAVELING ALONE.

A lady traveling without a male companion should be very careful how she accepts favors or assistance proffered by strangers.

Even in such a common case as where the lady has you children, it would be better for her to request the conduct to assist her in changing cars or to purchase her tickets to accept the offers to perform those services from a man who is a perfect stranger to her, and who may be one of the greatest scoundrels on the face of the earth, for all she knows to the contrary.

POLITENESS AT HOME.

Always speak with politeness and deference to your parents and friends. Some children are polite and civil everywhere except at home; but there they are coarse and rude. Nothing sits so gracefully upon children, nothing makes them so lovely, as habitual respect and dutiful deportment toward their parents and superiors. It makes the plainest face beautiful, and gives to every common action, a nameless but peculiar charm.—*Golden Rule*.

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GODDLE

For sale at the office of the Principia. For Cash Only.
DEMOCRACY OR CHAMPIONSHIP, 2 Vols., \$1.50. Postage 8cts.
SLAVERY AND SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol., \$1.00. Postage 25cts.
AMERICAN GLOBE, 1 VOL., \$1.00. Postage 16cts.

Postage 16cts.

OUR NATIONAL CHARTERS
THEIR HISTORY AND THE MILITIA.

I. The Federal Constitution of 1787-9.

II. The Articles of Confederation. 1778.

III. The Declaration of Independence. 1776.

IV. The Articles of Association. 1774.

With notes showing their bearing on slavery, and the relative powers of the State and National Governments. By Wm. Goddle.

A summary of *Legal Rules of Interpretation* and *Legal opinion* collected from the highest authorities, is prefixed to the Constitution. An APPENDIX contains extracts from State Constitutions and Bills of Rights—On page 1 of 1787 extract "any law from Northwest Territory"—one of the documents of the Revolutionary cause.

PRICE, Single Copies, 1 cent; \$1 by mail, 15 cents at same rate for any number up to 100 copies.

Twelve copies, \$1.00; \$1.25, \$1.50 at the Office.

Eighteen copies, by mail, \$1.25, \$1.45 at the Office.

Twenty-four copies, by mail, \$1.50, \$1.75 at the Office.

Price, per dozen, \$1.50, \$1.75 at the Office.

N.B. All postages on Books, Pamphlets, and Tracts, in paper, are free.

Also, for sale as above,
SPOONER'S *Unconstitutionality of Slavery*.

In paper, first price 10cts, postage 16cts.

We have no books, pamphlets, or tracts on any subject as these advertised, 2 vols. and it is not convenient for us to send orders for any of them.

1000 NEW YORK PRINTERS, 199 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK.